

Sharpness of the percolation transition in the two-dimensional contact process

J. van den Berg*

CWI[†] and VU University Amsterdam

email: J.van.den.Berg@cw.nl

Abstract

For ordinary (independent) percolation on a large class of lattices it is well-known that below the critical percolation parameter p_c , the cluster size distribution has exponential decay, and that power-law behaviour of this distribution can only occur at p_c . This behaviour is often called ‘sharpness of the percolation transition’.

For theoretical reasons as well as motivated by applied research, there is an increasing interest in percolation models with (weak) dependencies. For instance, biologists and agricultural researchers have used (stationary distributions of) certain two-dimensional contact-like processes to model vegetation patterns in an arid landscape (see [19]). In that context, occupied clusters are interpreted as patches of vegetation. For some of these models it is reported in [19] that computer simulations indicate power-law behaviour in some interval of positive length of a model parameter. This would mean that in these models the percolation transition is not sharp.

This motivated us to investigate similar questions for the ordinary (‘basic’) $2D$ contact process with parameter the infection rate λ . We show, using techniques from the papers [8] and [11] by Bollobás and Riordan, that for the upper invariant measure $\bar{\nu}_\lambda$ of this process the percolation transition is sharp: If λ is such that ($\bar{\nu}_\lambda$ -a.s.) there are no infinite clusters, then for all parameter values below λ the cluster-size distribution has exponential decay.

*Part of this research has been funded by the Dutch BSIK/BRICKS project.

[†]CWI, Science Park 123, 1098 SJ Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Key words and phrases: percolation, contact process, sharp transition, approximate zero-one law, sharp thresholds.

AMS 2000 subject classifications. Primary 60K35; secondary 92D40, 92D30, 82B43.

1 Introduction and statement of the main result

The Contact Process was introduced as a stochastic model for the spread of an infection in a population with a geometric structure, usually represented by the d -dimensional cubic lattice. Each vertex x of this lattice represents an individual, whose state, infected (1) or healthy (0), at time t is denoted by $\sigma_x(t)$. The dynamics in this model is as follows: A vertex in state 0 goes to state 1 ('becomes infected') at a rate equal to λ times the number of neighbours of that vertex that are in state 1. A vertex in state 1 goes to state 0 ('recovers') at rate 1. Here λ is the parameter of the model, called the infection rate. In this paper we restrict to the case $d = 2$. Depending on the applications one has in mind, the terms 'infected' and 'healthy' are sometimes replaced by 'occupied' and 'vacant' respectively. In the remainder of this paper we will use this latter terminology.

The configuration at time t is denoted by $\sigma(t) := (\sigma_x(t), x \in \mathbb{Z}^2)$. Let μ_t denote the distribution of σ_t when we start at time 0 with all vertices occupied.

It is well-known (from a standard coupling argument) that μ_t is stochastically dominated by μ_s if $s \leq t$. Hence μ_t converges weakly to a probability measure, denoted by $\bar{\nu}$ ($=\bar{\nu}_\lambda$) as $t \rightarrow \infty$. This measure $\bar{\nu}$ is called the upper invariant measure (abbreviated as u.i.m.). Realisations are typically denoted by $\sigma = (\sigma_x, x \in \mathbb{Z}^2)$. The occupied cluster of a vertex x (that is, the maximal connected component which contains x and of which every vertex is occupied) is denoted by $\mathcal{C}_x$. (If x is the origin, $\mathbf{0}$, we often omit the subscript).

In this paper we study the sizes of occupied clusters under the measure $\bar{\nu}$. Motivation comes from work by Liggett and Steif ([25]) who showed that for λ sufficiently large percolation occurs (that is, $\bar{\nu}_\lambda(|\mathcal{C}| = \infty) > 0$), and from work by biologists and agricultural researchers. In this latter work (see [19]), limit distributions of contact-like processes (more complicated than the 'basic process' described above) were used to model vegetation patterns

in arid regions in Spain and North-Africa. In this ‘agricultural’ context an occupied cluster is interpreted as a ‘vegetation patch’. For some of these models it was claimed in [19] that simulations suggest power law behaviour of the cluster size distribution in an interval of some parameter.

In ordinary percolation models it is known that below the percolation threshold the distribution of the cluster size has exponential decay, and that power-law behaviour can only occur at the percolation threshold. Triggered by the above mentioned claim by biologists and agricultural researchers concerning very different behaviour in ‘their’ contact-like processes, we study this question for $\bar{\nu}_\lambda$.

The proof of exponential decay for ordinary (independent) two-dimensional percolation goes back to the celebrated paper [20] by Kesten. A crucial step in that paper is, somewhat informally and in ‘modern’ terminology, that if the probability of the event A that there is an occupied crossing of a given, large, box (square) is neither close to 0 nor close to 1, the expected number of so-called pivotal vertices (or, for bond percolation, pivotal edges) is large. (These are vertices with the property that flipping the state of the vertex, flips the occurrence/non-occurrence of the event A). This step was proved in a ‘constructive’ way, with a ‘geometric’ flavour. The above mentioned large expectation of pivotal vertices implies that the derivative (w.r.t. the parameter p) of the probability of A is large. Hence, once the probability of A is not very small, a small increase of p makes it close to 1. (This property would now be called a ‘sharp-threshold’ phenomenon’).

Moreover, by separate arguments, so-called finite-size criteria hold: if the probability of A is smaller than some absolute constant ϵ , the cluster size is finite a.s. (and its distribution has exponential decay), while if it is larger than $1 - \epsilon$ the system percolates. Combining these things gives exponential decay of the cluster size for all p smaller than p_c .

Russo ([28]) proved a very general ‘approximate zero-one law’ and showed that the above mentioned sharp-threshold phenomenon can be obtained from this more general law, using only a minimum of percolation arguments. In particular, in this way Kesten’s ‘constructive, geometric’ arguments could be avoided, which is very useful because carrying out such arguments turns out to be (too) hard in many dependent models. (We should note, however, that for independent percolation the ‘constructive’ argument still gives the shortest self-contained proof, and that in *some* dependent models, see [2], it gives the only currently known proof).

Unfortunately, the above-mentioned finite-size criteria involved a so-called RSW result of which no (‘reasonably general’) extension to dependent models was known. This explains why, for a long time, Russo’s approximate zero-one law did not receive much attention in the percolation community. In the meantime, results related to Russo’s approximate zero-one law, but considerably sharper and more explicit, were obtained (in other areas of probability and mathematics in general) by Kahn, Kalai and Linial ([18]), Talagrand ([29]) and Friedgut and Kalai ([14]). (See also [27]).

The importance for percolation of these sharp-threshold results became clear much later, when Bollobás and Riordan ([8]) proved a more robust version of the RSW theorem which, combined with a clever use of the sharp-threshold results, led to the proof of the long-standing conjecture that the critical probability for random Voronoi percolation in the plane is $1/2$ (and that below $1/2$ this model has exponential decay). The robustness of these arguments led to similar results for several other two-dimensional percolation models (see [9], [11] and [3]).

The last mentioned paper proved, for 2D lattice models, exponential decay below the percolation threshold under the quite general condition that, informally speaking, the model has a ‘nice finitary representation’ (in a well-defined sense) in terms of finite-valued independent random variables. It turned out that under that condition only a weak (not explicitly quantitative) form, close to that of Russo’s ([28]), of the sharp-threshold results was needed. As an example it was shown that the Ising model (with fixed $\beta < \beta_c$ and external field parameter h playing the role of p in ordinary percolation) belongs to this class (thus giving an alternative, more streamlined, proof of the main result in Higuchi’s paper [17]). Here the role of finite-valued independent random variables was played by the ‘independent updates’ in a suitable discrete-time dynamics. Such a dynamics was possible by (among other things) the nearest-neighbour Gibbs property of the Ising model. This is a big difference with the contact process, for which we don’t know a suitable discrete-time dynamics. Therefore, we were not able to derive exponential decay for this model from Theorem 2.2 in [3], but instead exploited the full quantitative nature of the sharp-threshold results from [18] and [29] and followed more closely the route used in [8] and [11] for the Voronoi model and the Johnson-Mehl model (which, like the Voronoi model, is a model of planar tessellations, but more complicated than the Voronoi model). (Yet another route, namely by using results in [15], might work if $\bar{\nu}$ would satisfy the strong FKG condition, which however (as has been shown by Liggett) it does not.

We should also note here that the exponential-decay arguments in [1] and [26], which for ordinary percolation work in all dimensions, so far have (even in 2D) no suitable analog for dependent percolation).

Our main result is the following:

Theorem 1.1. *Let λ be such that*

$$\bar{\nu}_\lambda(|\mathcal{C}| = \infty) = 0.$$

Then, for every $\lambda' < \lambda$ there exist $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that for all $n \geq 1$

$$\bar{\nu}_{\lambda'}(|\mathcal{C}| \geq n) \leq C_1 \exp(-C_2 n). \quad (1)$$

Section 2 states properties of the contact process and other (more general) ingredients needed in the proof. It also indicates (see the Remark below Lemma 2.3) an alternative proof of the earlier mentioned result by Liggett and Steif that percolation occurs for λ large enough.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is given in Section 3. As mentioned before, the essence is still (as it was in [20]) to show sharp-threshold behaviour for certain crossing probabilities. To do this, we follow the main strategy in [8] and [11]. However, the model-specific properties of the contact process lead to many non-trivial differences in the steps. Therefore, and because the contact process is one of the main random spatial models, the proof is given in detail.

We use several well-known results, techniques and terminology from percolation theory. For an introduction to, and general information on, percolation see [16] and [10], and contact processes see [24].

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Contact process ingredients

A well-known classical result for the Contact Process is that there is a critical value λ_c such that:

- (a) If $\lambda < \lambda_c$ the contact process ‘dies out’, and $\bar{\nu}$ is concentrated on the trivial configuration where all vertices are vacant.
- (b) If $\lambda > \lambda_c$, $\bar{\nu}$ is non-trivial, and μ_t converges exponentially to $\bar{\nu}$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ (see Theorem 2.30 and equation (2.31) in [24] which are based on the work by Bezuidenhout-Grimmett ([6] and [7]):

For all $\lambda > \lambda_c$ there exist $C_3, C_4 > 0$ such that for all $t > 0$

$$\mu_t(\sigma_O = 1) - \bar{\nu}(\sigma_O = 1) \leq C_3 \exp(-C_4 t). \quad (2)$$

Since $\bar{\nu}$ is dominated by μ_t , statement (b) above implies, by standard arguments:

Theorem 2.1. *For all $\lambda > \lambda_c$ there exist $C_3, C_4 > 0$ such that for all $t > 0$ and all $\Lambda \subset \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$,*

$$d_V(\mu_{t;\Lambda}, \bar{\nu}_{\lambda;\Lambda}) \leq |\Lambda| C_3 \exp(-C_4 t), \quad (3)$$

where d_V denotes variational distance, and $\mu_{t;\Lambda}$ (and $\bar{\nu}_{\lambda;\Lambda}$) are the restriction of μ_t (resp. $\bar{\nu}_\lambda$) to Λ .

Remark: It is trivial from the definition of λ_c that for λ below p_c no percolation of occupied vertices occurs; that is, $\bar{\nu}_\lambda(|\mathcal{C}| = \infty) = 0$. As we mentioned in the Introduction, Liggett and Steif ([25]) showed that if λ is large enough, percolation does occur. It seems to be widely believed (but no proof is known yet) that the critical value for having percolation is strictly larger than λ_c .

A well-known and very useful way to describe the contact process is by means of a space-time diagram (graphical representation): Consider for each vertex $v \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ its ‘time axis’ $\{v\} \times (-\infty, \infty)$, and consider five independent Poisson point processes on this time axis: one with rate λ for each of the four directions (left, right, up, down) in the lattice, and one to indicate a transition from 1 to 0. The Poisson processes of the different vertices are independent of each other.

The interpretation of a Poisson point on the time axis of v at time t for (say) the direction ‘right’ is that if v is in state 1 at time t , it ‘infects’ the vertex $v + (1, 0)$. (That is, if the latter vertex is not occupied, it becomes occupied). To visualise this we draw an arrow from (v, t) to $(v + (1, 0), t)$. For each of the other three directions we act similarly. The interpretation of a Poisson point in the fifth process on the time axis of v at time t is that if v is occupied (in state 1) at time t^- , it becomes immediately vacant (0). In the space-time picture this is marked by the symbol $*$ at (v, t) (see e.g. [24], Part I, Section 1).

An active (space-time) path is a path that is allowed to move upward in time along the time axes without hitting $*$ points, and to jump from one time

axis to another along (and in the direction of) an arrow. For $v, w \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ and $s < t$ we denote by $(v, s) \rightarrow (w, t)$ that there is an active path from (v, s) to (w, t) . For the contact process starting at time 0 with every vertex occupied, a vertex w is occupied at time $t > 0$ if and only if (in terms of the above mentioned space-time diagram) for some vertex v there is an active path from $(v, 0)$ to (w, t) . In other words, the joint distribution of the random variables

$$I\{\exists v \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \text{ s.t. } (v, 0) \rightarrow (w, t)\}, \quad w \in \mathbb{Z}^2$$

is μ_t . Similarly, $\bar{\nu}$ is the joint distribution of the random variables

$$I\{\forall t < 0 \exists v \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \text{ s.t. } (v, t) \rightarrow (w, 0)\}, \quad w \in \mathbb{Z}^2.$$

We will often work with the following ‘truncated’ random variables. First some more notation: The distance between two vertices $v = (i_1, j_1)$ and $w = (i_2, j_2)$ is defined as $\max(|i_1 - i_2|, |j_1 - j_2|)$ and denoted by $d(v, w)$. The distance $d(V, W)$ between two subsets V and W of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ is defined as $\min(\{d(v, w) : v \in V, w \in W\})$. For $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$, σ_Λ denotes the collection of random variables $(\sigma_v, v \in \Lambda)$; straightforward generalizations of this notation will also be used.

Let

$$\sigma_x^{(n)} := I\{\exists (y, t) \text{ with } d(x, y) = \lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor \text{ or } t = -\sqrt{n} \text{ s.t. } (y, t) \rightarrow (x, 0)\}, \quad (4)$$

and let $\bar{\nu}^{(n)} = \bar{\nu}_\lambda^{(n)}$ denote the joint distribution of the random variables $\sigma_x^{(n)}, x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$.

It is clear from this definition that if Λ and Λ' are two finite subsets of $\mathbb{Z}^2$, and $d(\Lambda, \Lambda') > 2\sqrt{n}$, then $\sigma_\Lambda^{(n)}$ and $\sigma_{\Lambda'}^{(n)}$ are independent. It is also clear that σ is stochastically dominated by $\sigma^{(n)}$.

From Theorem 2.1 (and simple estimates concerning the ‘spatial spread of infection in a limited time interval’) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \lambda > \lambda_c \exists C_5, C_6 > 0 \text{ s.t. } \forall \Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ d_V(\sigma_\Lambda, \sigma_\Lambda^{(n)}) \leq |\Lambda| C_5 \exp(-C_6 n^{1/2}). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Remark: In this paper we often deal with spatial boxes of length of order n , and distances of order n to each other; the (somewhat arbitrary) choice of $\sqrt{n}$ in the definition (4) is just one of the many possible choices that are convenient in such situations.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_k$ be $3n \times n$ -rectangles with the property that $d(\Lambda_i, \Lambda_j) > 2\lfloor\sqrt{n}\rfloor$, $1 \leq i < j \leq k$. Further let $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_k$ be events that are completely determined by, and increasing in, the σ variables on $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \dots, \Lambda_k$ respectively. Then, for every $\lambda > \lambda_c$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{i=1}^k \bar{\nu}_\lambda(A_i) &\leq \bar{\nu}_\lambda\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^k A_i\right) \leq \bar{\nu}_\lambda^{(n)}\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^k A_i\right) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^k \bar{\nu}_\lambda^{(n)}(A_i) \leq \prod_{i=1}^k (\bar{\nu}_\lambda(A_i) + C_5 8n^2 \exp(-C_6 \sqrt{n})). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Proof. The first inequality comes from positive association (Harris-FKG inequality) and the last inequality comes from (5). The second inequality and the equality follow immediately from the definitions. $\square$

Let, for a rectangular box R in the lattice, $H(R)$ denote the event that there is an occupied horizontal crossing of R . Further, let $H(n, m)$ denote the event that there is an occupied horizontal crossing of the box $[0, n] \times [0, m]$. For vertical occupied crossings we use a similar notation, with V instead of H . From now on, when we write ‘crossing’ we always mean ‘occupied crossing’.

Lemma 2.3. (Finite-size criterion)

$$\exists \hat{\varepsilon} > 0 \ \forall \lambda > \lambda_c \ \exists \hat{N} \ \forall N \geq \hat{N}$$

the following holds:

$$(a) \text{ If } \bar{\nu}_\lambda(V(3N, N)) < \hat{\varepsilon}, \text{ the distribution of } |\mathcal{C}| \text{ has exponential decay.} \quad (7)$$

$$(b) \text{ If } \bar{\nu}_\lambda(H(3N, N)) > 1 - \hat{\varepsilon}, \text{ then } \bar{\nu}_\lambda(|\mathcal{C}| = \infty) > 0. \quad (8)$$

Remark: For our purpose (as will become clear later in this paper) we do not need $\hat{N}$ in the above lemma to be uniform in λ if λ is bounded away from λ_c . However, although this is not explicitly stated in the literature but pointed out to me by Geoffrey Grimmett (private communication), (2) and related bounds are (by the nature of their proofs in the literature) uniform in λ (if λ is bounded away from λ_c). Now, such uniformity would also give uniformity of $\hat{N}$ (in the sense mentioned above). This then, in turn, would

clearly give an alternative proof of the earlier mentioned result by Liggett and Steif that $\bar{\nu}_\lambda$ has percolation if λ is large enough: Take some $\lambda' > \lambda_c$. Fix N such that for all $\lambda > \lambda'$ statement (b) in Lemma 2.3 holds. It is easy to see that (with N fixed), if $\lambda > \lambda'$ is large enough, the condition in statement (b) holds; hence $\bar{\nu}_\lambda(|\mathcal{C}_O| = \infty) > 0$. Since this result is already known, and not the main subject of this paper, we do not work out the details of such alternative proof. (It should also be noted that Liggett and Steif prove more than percolation of $\bar{\nu}$: they show (for large λ) domination of (high-density) product measures).

Proof. (of Lemma 2.3). The analog of part (a) was proved for ordinary percolation by Kesten in [21], by a block argument. His proof can be, and has been in the literature, easily adapted to dependent models with sufficient spatial mixing; for an example see Lemma 3.8 in [3]. The mixing property described by (6) above is ‘more than enough’ for this purpose: essential is that the ‘extra term’ (here $C_5 8n^2 \exp(-C_6 \sqrt{n})$) in the factors in the r.h.s. of (6) goes to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

The analog of (b) was proved for ordinary percolation in [13] by giving a suitable (and now well-known) lower bound for the probability of having a horizontal crossing of a $4n \times 2n$ box in terms of the probability of the analogous event for a $2n \times n$ box. If for some n this probability is sufficiently close to 1, one can then iterate this procedure and conclude that the probability, say r_k , that there is a crossing of a given $2^{k+1}n \times 2^k n$ box goes very fast to 1 as $k \rightarrow \infty$. (So fast that $\sum_k (1 - r_k)$ is finite). By Borel-Cantelli it then follows that a.s. there is a K , such that for all odd $k \geq K$, there is horizontal crossing of the rectangle $[0, 2^{k+1}n] \times [0, 2^k n]$ and for all even $k \geq K$ there is a vertical crossing of $[0, 2^k n] \times [0, 2^{k+1}n]$. By pasting together these crossings, one gets an infinite occupied path; hence, the system percolates. For dependent percolation models with sufficiently strong mixing properties simple modifications of such arguments can be obtained (and have been obtained in the literature). Informally speaking, instead of blowing the rectangles up by a factor 2, this is then done by a factor 3 to obtain an extra strip in the middle of the next rectangle in order to separate the other two strips so that the crossing events of these other two strips are almost independent. See, for instance, the proof of Theorem 4.8 in [4] for a case where this has been carried out in detail. In practically the same way this can be carried out in our current situation (using Lemma 2.2 above in the same way as Lemma 2.3 was used in the proof of Theorem 5.1 in [4]). $\square$

The following involves what in the Introduction was called a robust version of RSW.

Proposition 2.4. *Let $\lambda > \lambda_c$.*

$$\text{If for some } \rho > 0, \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\nu}_\lambda(H(\rho n, n)) > 0,$$

then

$$\text{for all } \rho > 0, \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\nu}_\lambda(H(\rho n, n)) > 0.$$

Proof. A similar result was proved by Bollobás and Riordan [8] for the random Voronoi model (and slightly modified to the above form in [4]). As remarked in [9] (see also the first three paragraphs of Section 3.4 in [3]) it holds for many percolation models on $\mathbb{Z}^2$, namely those that satisfy: (i) A sufficiently strong mixing property; (ii) A straightforward ‘geometric’ condition about lattice paths (which enables to paste together paths that cross each other); (iii) Positive association; and (iv) The condition that $\bar{\nu}$ is invariant under the symmetries of $\mathbb{Z}^2$.

Lemma 2.2 above is ‘more than needed’ for (i), and it is easy to see that the probability measures $\bar{\nu}_\lambda$, $\lambda > \lambda_c$, also satisfies the other conditions. $\square$

2.2 Influence and sharp-threshold results

Let $\Omega = \{0, 1\}^n$ and let P_p denote the product measure with parameter p on Ω . Let A be an event (i.e. a subset of Ω) and let, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, I_i denote the probability that i is pivotal for A . (It is often called the influence of i). More precisely,

$$I_i := P_p(\{\omega \in \Omega : \text{ exactly one of } \omega \text{ and } \omega^{(i)} \text{ is in } A\},$$

where $\omega^{(i)}$ is the configuration obtained from ω by flipping the i th component of ω . Talagrand ([29], Corollary 1.2; see also [18] and [14] for strongly related results) proved the following theorem. (Note that ‘our’ I_i differs a factor $1/p$ from the expression $\mu_p(A_i)$ in Talagrand’s paper).

Theorem 2.5.

$$\sum_i I_i \geq \frac{P_p(A)(1 - P_p(A))}{Kp \log(2/p)} \log\left(\frac{1}{p \max_i I_i}\right), \quad (9)$$

where K is a universal constant.

Remark: If the event A is increasing (that is, its indicator function is a coordinatewise non-decreasing function on Ω), the l.h.s. of (9) is, according to Russo's formula equal to $d/dp P_p(A)$. By this it is easy to see that Theorem 2.5 implies that if, throughout some interval, say (p_1, p_2) , $\max_i I_i$ is 'very small', and $P_{p_1}(A)$ is 'not small', then $P_{p_2}(A)$ is 'close to 1'. For such reasons Theorem 2.5 and related theorems are often indicated by the name 'sharp-threshold' results (besides names like 'influence results').

Now suppose there are at least m indices i with the property that $I_i = \max_j I_j$. There are two possibilities, (a) and (b) below:

(a) $\max_i I_i \leq \frac{\log m}{pm}$. If this holds, then, by Theorem 2.5,

$$\sum_i I_i \geq \frac{P_p(A)(1 - P_p(A))}{Kp \log(2/p)} \log\left(\frac{m}{\log m}\right) \geq \frac{P_p(A)(1 - P_p(A))}{\tilde{K}p \log(2/p)} \log m, \quad (10)$$

for some universal constant $\tilde{K}$.

(b) $\max_i I_i \geq \frac{\log m}{pm}$. Then, trivially,

$$\sum_i I_i \geq m \max_i I_i \geq \frac{\log m}{p},$$

which is larger than or equal to some universal constant times the r.h.s. of (10). Hence (by adjusting the value K if needed) the following holds:

Corollary 2.6. *Let m denote the cardinality of $\{i : I_i = \max_j I_j\}$. Then*

$$\sum_i I_i \geq \frac{P_p(A)(1 - P_p(A))}{Kp \log(2/p)} \log m.$$

Remark: The case $m = n$ of this Corollary is, essentially, in [14] where it is derived from the results/methods in [18]; the general case, and its derivation from Theorem 2.5, was shown to me by Oliver Riordan (private communication; see also [12]).

We will use a generalization of Theorem 2.5 and Corollary 2.6, as described below.

Let Ω be as before. Let $V \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$ and let $0 < p_1 < p_2 < 1$. Let P_{p_1, p_2} denote the product measure on Ω under which each component with index in V is 1 with probability p_1 and each with index in V^c is 1 with probability p_2 . The generalization of Theorem 2.5 is the following:

Theorem 2.7.

$$\sum_i I_i \geq \frac{P_{p_1, p_2}(A)(1 - P_{p_1, p_2}(A))}{K' p_2 \log(2/p_1)} \log\left(\frac{1}{p_2 \max_i I_i}\right),$$

where K' is a universal constant.

Remark: In [12] (see Theorem 5 in [12] and the discussion below that theorem) it is indicated how to prove Theorem 2.7 by modifications of the proofs in Talagrand's paper. An alternative way is to start from the special case for $p = 1/2$ of Theorem 2.5 above, and obtain the full case (and its generalization where different coordinates may have a different parameter p) from that special case by, informally speaking, representing (approximately) the toss of a biased coin, by a combination of tosses of several fair coins.

From Theorem 2.7 the following Corollary is obtained in exactly the same way as Corollary 2.6 was obtained from Theorem 2.5.

Corollary 2.8. *Let m denote the cardinality of $\{i : I_i = \max_j I_j\}$. Then*

$$\sum_i I_i \geq \frac{P_{p_1, p_2}(A)(1 - P_{p_1, p_2}(A))}{K' p_2 \log(2/p_1)} \log m.$$

3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Proof. Let $\lambda_1 > \lambda_c$ be such that under $\bar{\nu}_{\lambda_1}$ the cluster size distribution does not have exponential decay. Let $\lambda_2 > \lambda_1$. We will show that $\bar{\nu}_{\lambda_2}(|\mathcal{C}_O| = \infty) > 0$. This will immediately imply Theorem 1.1.

Let λ_1 be as fixed above, and let $\hat{\varepsilon}$ and $\hat{N} = \hat{N}(\lambda_1)$ be as in Lemma 2.3. Let L_n denote a specific $4n \times n$ rectangle; its precise choice does not matter, but for later convenience we choose $[n, 5n] \times [n, 2n]$. By Lemma 2.3 we have that

$$\bar{\nu}_{\lambda_1}(V(3n, n)) > \hat{\varepsilon}, \text{ for all } n \geq \hat{N},$$

which by Proposition 2.4 implies $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\nu}_{\lambda}(H(L_n)) > 0$; so there exists an $\tilde{\varepsilon} > 0$ and a sequence $n_1, n_2, \dots$ such that

$$\bar{\nu}_{\lambda_1}(H(L_{n_i})) > \tilde{\varepsilon}, \text{ for all } i. \tag{11}$$

From now on we consider such fixed sequence.

In the introduction to the contact process in the beginning of Section 1 we assumed that the recovery rate is 1. Of course, the contact process with infection rate λ and recovery rate δ is simply a time-rescaled version of the contact process with infection rate λ/δ and recovery rate 1. In particular, these two contact processes have exactly the same upper invariant measure. For application of the results in Section 2.2 it is more convenient to work with one-parameter Poisson processes for which at each site of the lattice the total rate of all the Poisson processes is constant, say 1. Therefore we consider the contact process with infection rate $q/4$ and recovery rate $1 - q$, where now $q \in (0, 1)$ is the parameter. Note that in terms of the space-time diagram this means that on each time axis we have a marked Poisson point process with density 1, and each point corresponds with a $\rightarrow$, $\leftarrow$, $\downarrow$, $\uparrow$ or $*$ with probability $q/4$, $q/4$, $q/4$, $q/4$ and $1 - q$ respectively. With respect to this new parameter q we use the notation $\mathcal{P}_q$ for the law governing the above marked Poisson point process, and the notation $\bar{\nu}_{<q>}$ for the upper invariant measure of the corresponding contact process. From the above it is immediate that

$$\bar{\nu}_{<q>} = \bar{\nu}_{\frac{q}{4(1-q)}}, \quad q \in (0, 1), \quad (12)$$

or, equivalently, $\bar{\nu}_\lambda = \bar{\nu}_{<4\lambda/(1+4\lambda)>}$, for $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$. In particular, by (11),

$$\bar{\nu}_{<q_1>}(H(L_{n_i})) > \tilde{\varepsilon} \quad \text{for all } i. \quad (13)$$

Let $\bar{\nu}_{<q>}^{(n)}$ be the distribution of $(\eta_x^{(n)}, x \in \mathbb{Z}^d)$ defined by (compare with (4)):

$$\eta_x^{(n)} := I\{\exists(y, t) \text{ with } d(x, y) = \lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor \text{ or } t < -\sqrt{n} \text{ s.t. } (y, t) \xrightarrow{(q, 1-q)} (x, 0)\}, \quad (14)$$

where $(y, t) \xrightarrow{(q, 1-q)} (x, 0)$ denotes that there is a space-time path from (y, t) to $(x, 0)$ in the space-time diagram with Poisson intensity $q/4$ for each of the four types of arrows, and Poisson intensity $1 - q$ for $*$'s.

It is clear that $\bar{\nu}_{<q>}^{(n)}$ dominates $\bar{\nu}_{<q>}$; hence by (13),

$$\bar{\nu}_{<q_1>}^{(n_i)}(H(L_{n_i})) > \tilde{\varepsilon}, \quad \text{for all } i. \quad (15)$$

Although $\bar{\nu}_\lambda^{(n)}$ is, of course, not the same as $\bar{\nu}_{<4\lambda/(1+4\lambda)>}^{(n)}$, it is straightforward to get analogs of the earlier ‘approximation lemma’s’. In particular we

get, as analog of (5):

$$\begin{aligned} \forall q > 4\lambda_c/(1 + 4\lambda_c) \exists C_7, C_8 > 0 \text{ s.t. } \forall \Lambda \subset \subset \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ d_V \left(\bar{\nu}_{<q>;\Lambda}, \bar{\nu}_{<q>;\Lambda}^{(n)} \right) \leq |\Lambda| C_7 \exp(-C_8 n^{1/2}). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

A step towards application of the results in Section 2.2 is a suitable ‘time-discretized’ version of $\bar{\nu}_{<q>}^{(n)}$. A significant obstacle is to obtain an analog of (15) for these discrete variables.

Recall (see the beginning of this Section) that L_n is the box $[n, 5n] \times [n, 2n]$. To ‘get ample room for the underlying Poisson points’ we also consider the larger box $B_n := [0, 6n] \times [0, 3n]$. Let $\bar{\nu}_{<q>}^{(n)}$ be as before. Note that the collection of random variables $(\eta_x^{(n)}, x \in L_n)$ is completely determined by the (marked) Poisson points in the space-time area $ST(n) := B_n \times [-n, 0]$. (In fact only a subset of that area is involved, but for convenience we consider this whole area). Let, as before, $\mathcal{P}_q$ denote the probability measure governing the marked Poisson points. Let $\alpha > 0$. (Later we choose α sufficiently small). Let $\delta = n^{-\alpha}$. We say that an active space-time path π is δ -stable if there are no $(y, s) \in \pi$ and $(z, u) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \times \mathbb{R}$ with $d(y, z) \leq 1$ and $|u - s| < \delta$ such that there is an arrow at (y, s) , and a $*$ at (z, u) .

The following Lemma (and the global structure of its proof) is the analog of Theorem 6.1 for the Voronoi model in [8] and Theorem 8 for the Johnson-Mehl tessellations in [11] (see also [12]). Since the proof is subtle and differs in many details from that in [8] and [12] we give a full proof.

Remark: In some sense the proof of Lemma 3.1 is easier (and shorter) than that of the corresponding results in [8] and [11]. This is partly due to the fact that in our model the continuous object that has to be properly discretized (the time axis) is one-dimensional. This enables us to ‘play’ with the order (in time) of the Poisson points. On the other hand, our model has some extra complications, e.g. there is no natural order on the arrow values assigned to the Poisson points (an arrow to the right is not always better than an arrow to the left). Fortunately these issues can be handled quite smoothly.

Lemma 3.1. (Stability coupling) *Let $0 < q < q' < 1$. For each n there is a coupling of $\mathcal{P}_q$ and $\mathcal{P}_{q'}$ such that w.h.p. (i.e. with probability tending to*

1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$) the following holds: For every $x \in L_n$ that has $\eta_x^{(n)} = 1$ in the first copy, there is a $(y, t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \times (-\infty, 0)$ with $d(x, y) = \lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor$ or $t = -\sqrt{n}$ such that there is a δ -stable space-time path in the second copy from (y, t) to $(x, 0)$ (and hence $\eta_x^{(n)}$ also equals 1 in the second copy).

Proof. Let $\delta_1 = n^{-\alpha/2}$. (So $\delta \ll \delta_1$). We partition every ‘time axis’ $\{x\} \times [-\infty, 0]$, $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, in intervals $\{x\} \times (-(k+1)\delta_1, -k\delta_1]$, $k = 0, 1, \dots$ of length δ_1 . From now on, when we use the word ‘interval’, we will always mean an interval of the above form, with $x \in B_n$ and $(k+1)\delta_1 \leq n$. Note that the total number of intervals is $M_n := |B_n| \lfloor n/\delta_1 \rfloor$. Let $\mathcal{I}_n$ denote the union of these intervals.

Note that the total number of Poisson points in $\mathcal{I}_n$ is Poisson distributed with mean $\delta_1 M_n$. To construct the coupling, first draw a number N according to the above mentioned Poisson distribution. Now assign N points (called ‘particles’) randomly (uniformly, and independently of each other) to the above mentioned set $\mathcal{I}_n$. If a particle is assigned to the space-time location (x, t) , we say that its time coordinate is t . Call an interval ‘occupied’ if it has at least one particle. Call two different intervals $\{x\} \times (-(k+1)\delta_1, -k\delta_1]$ and $\{y\} \times (-(l+1)\delta_1, -l\delta_1]$ neighbours if $d(x, y) \leq 1$ and $|k - l| \leq 1$. This gives rise, in an obvious way, to the notion of ‘clusters (of occupied intervals)’. (This notion of cluster is of course different from that introduced earlier in this paper. Since this ‘new’ notion of cluster is used only in this proof (and the other notion is not used here), this should not cause any confusion and we even use the same notation $\mathcal{C}$).

We have already assigned, to each particle, a precise location in $\mathcal{I}_n$. However, we ‘suppress’ this precise information and only ‘keep’ the following *partial information*: For each interval the number of particles assigned to it, and for each occupied cluster of intervals the relative order (w.r.t. their time coordinates) of all particles in that cluster.

From now on, when we mention a cluster $\mathcal{C}$, we mean not only its corresponding set of intervals, but also the above mentioned partial information.

By the size of a cluster we mean the number of particles in the cluster. By a simple ‘counting argument’ it is easy to see that there is $\gamma \geq 0$ (which is a function of δ_1 which goes to ∞ as $\delta_1 \rightarrow 0$) such that the probability that the size of the cluster containing a given interval is larger than k is at most $\exp(-\gamma k)$, and hence

$$P(\exists \text{ a cluster with size } \geq C \log n) \leq M_n(\delta_1) \exp(-\gamma C \log n) \leq C' n^{3+\alpha/2-\gamma C}, \quad (17)$$

where C' is a constant. Since, for fixed α , δ_1 is a function of n , we can consider γ as a function of n satisfying $\gamma(n) \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, for each choice of α , we have that for every $\beta > 0$, w.h.p. (i.e. with probability tending to 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$) all clusters are smaller than $\beta \log n$.

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a cluster (including the partial information given above). Now consider, for both parameter values (q and q') the conditional distribution of the precise configuration for $\mathcal{C}$, i.e. the types ($*$, $\leftarrow$, $\rightarrow$, $\uparrow$ or $\downarrow$) and precise locations of all particles in $\mathcal{C}$, given the partial information. The two conditional distributions can be coupled by the following natural procedure which gives two ‘typical realizations’ (one for each of the two parameter values) of the precise configuration.

The first step in this procedure is to assign, with equal probabilities ($1/4$), a *tentative* $\leftarrow$, $\rightarrow$, $\uparrow$ or $\downarrow$ to each particle (independent of the other particles) of $\mathcal{C}$. The interpretation is that *if* eventually a particle is chosen to represent an arrow, the type of arrow is exactly its above mentioned tentative one. We also assign to each particle i , independent of the other particles, a random variable U_i , uniformly distributed on $(0, 1)$. These variables will be used below to decide if a particle corresponds with an arrow or with a $*$.

The next step is to go from relative order of positions to precise positions. Consider the conditional distribution of the precise time coordinates of the particles of $\mathcal{C}$, given their (already known) relative order in time and the intervals they are located in. Now simply assign the precise locations by drawing from this distribution. Later we will refer to this procedure as the ‘time assignment procedure’.

Note that both steps above are the same for both ‘realizations’ (the one for parameter q and the one with parameter q'). However, the next (and final) step, in which the types of the particles are fully determined, will take into account the parameter value: For each particle i of $\mathcal{C}$ do the following. If $U_i < q$, the type of i (in each of the two copies) is equal to the earlier mentioned *tentative* arrow. If $U_i \in (q, q')$, its type is $*$ in copy 1 and equal to the tentative arrow in copy 2. If $U_i > q'$, the type is $*$ in both copies.

Now we have two realizations, say $\omega_{\mathcal{C}}(1)$ and $\omega_{\mathcal{C}}(2)$, and it is easy to see that they are ‘typical’ w.r.t. the two conditional distributions mentioned above, so that we indeed have a coupling of these two conditional distribu-

tions. Also note that $\omega_{\mathcal{C}}(2) \geq \omega_{\mathcal{C}}(1)$ in the sense that each particle in $\omega_{\mathcal{C}}(1)$ that has an arrow-type, has the same arrow-type (and space-time location) in $\omega_{\mathcal{C}}(2)$. Let this coupling be denoted by $P_{\mathcal{C}}$.

Doing this for each cluster, independently of the other clusters, gives a natural coupling of the two probability measures in the statement of the lemma. However, it is not yet what we want: Although it satisfies the property between brackets at the end of the Lemma, it does not necessarily satisfy the stability property in the lemma. The coupling we do want is obtained as follows, where we go back to the level of a given cluster $\mathcal{C}$. Recall the two copies $\omega_{\mathcal{C}}(1)$ and $\omega_{\mathcal{C}}(2)$ above, and their joint distribution $P_{\mathcal{C}}$. From $P_{\mathcal{C}}$ we will construct a modified distribution $\tilde{P}_{\mathcal{C}}$ of which the two marginal distributions are the same as those of $P_{\mathcal{C}}$. To avoid an abundance of notation, we will drop the subscript $\mathcal{C}$ from $\omega_{\mathcal{C}}(1)$ and $\omega_{\mathcal{C}}(2)$.

Recall the time assignment procedure in the (second step of the construction of) $P_{\mathcal{C}}$. Let B be the event that in $\omega(1)$ (and hence, since the particle locations for $\omega(1)$ and $\omega(2)$ are the same, also in $\omega(2)$) there are two different particles in $\mathcal{C}$ whose time coordinates differ less than δ . The probability of B (or, more precisely, the conditional probability of B given the partial information on $\mathcal{C}$) is maximal if $\mathcal{C}$ consists of one interval only, in which case it is less than or equal to $|\mathcal{C}|^2 \frac{2\delta}{\delta_1} = |\mathcal{C}|^2 2n^{-\alpha/2}$, where $|\mathcal{C}|$ denotes the number of particles in $\mathcal{C}$; so

$$P_{\mathcal{C}}(B) \leq |\mathcal{C}|^2 2n^{-\alpha/2}. \quad (18)$$

Recall the use of the variables U_i in the determination of the types of the points. Let G be the event that each particle in $\omega(1)$ is of type $*$ and each particle in $\omega(2)$ has an arrow type. Note that this event happens if and only if $U_i \in (q, q')$ for all particles i in $\mathcal{C}$, so that we have

$$P_{\mathcal{C}}(G) = (q' - q)^{|\mathcal{C}|}.$$

By this and (18) there is a $\beta' > 0$ such that

$$P_{\mathcal{C}}(G) \geq P_{\mathcal{C}}(B) \text{ if } |\mathcal{C}| \leq \beta' \log n, \quad (19)$$

and n is sufficiently large.

Now let B' denote $B \setminus G$. If $|\mathcal{C}| \leq \beta' \log n$ then, by (19) there is a (measurable) subset $G' \subset G \setminus B$ and a 1-1 map $\psi : B' \rightarrow G'$ with the property that ψ and ψ^{-1} are $P_{\mathcal{C}}$ -preserving. To each pair $(\omega(1), \omega(2)) \in B'$

this map assigns the pair

$$\psi(\omega(1), \omega(2)) = ((\psi(\omega(1), \omega(2)))(1), (\psi(\omega(1), \omega(2)))(2)).$$

Now a modified coupling, called $\tilde{P}_{\mathcal{C}}$, is obtained from $P_{\mathcal{C}}$ by exchange, between B' and G' , of the second copy, using ψ , as follows. (Such a modification is called a ‘cross-over’ in [8]). If $|\mathcal{C}| > \beta' \log n$ we simply take $\tilde{P}_{\mathcal{C}} = P_{\mathcal{C}}$. Otherwise, a typical pair $(\tilde{\omega}(1), \tilde{\omega}(2))$ under $\tilde{P}_{\mathcal{C}}$ is drawn as follows. First draw a pair $(\omega(1), \omega(2))$ under $P_{\mathcal{C}}$. If $(\omega(1), \omega(2)) \in (B' \cup G')^c$ take $(\tilde{\omega}(1), \tilde{\omega}(2))$ equal to $(\omega(1), \omega(2))$. If $(\omega(1), \omega(2)) \in B'$, take $\tilde{\omega}(1) = \omega$ and $\tilde{\omega}(2) = (\psi(\omega(1), \omega(2)))(2)$. Finally, if $(\omega(1), \omega(2)) \in G'$ take $\tilde{\omega}(1) = \omega(1)$ and $\tilde{\omega}(2) = (\psi^{-1}(\omega(1), \omega(2)))(2)$. Since, in all cases, $(\tilde{\omega}(1) = \omega(2))$, it is immediate that the first marginal of $\tilde{P}_{\mathcal{C}}$ is equal to that of $P_{\mathcal{C}}$. A short inspection shows that also the second marginal of $\tilde{P}_{\mathcal{C}}$ is equal to that of $P_{\mathcal{C}}$.

Now the ‘overall’ coupling of $\mathcal{P}_q$ and $\mathcal{P}_{q'}$ announced in the statement of the Lemma is obtained, in a natural and straightforward way, by constructing the pair $(\tilde{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}}(1), \tilde{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}}(2))$ for each cluster $\mathcal{C}$ separately, independently of the other clusters.

To check the required properties of this coupling, first look again at one single cluster $\mathcal{C}$. Suppose that $|\mathcal{C}| \leq \beta' \log n$. Let $(\omega(1), \omega(2))$ and the corresponding pair $(\tilde{\omega}(1), \tilde{\omega}(2))$ be as above (so, in particular, $\tilde{\omega}(1) = \omega(1)$), and suppose that $\tilde{\omega}(1)$ has a certain space-time path π , with at least one arrow, within $\mathcal{C}$. We have to consider a few cases:

(i) If $(\omega(1), \omega(2)) \in (B' \cup G')^c$ then $\tilde{\omega}(2) = \omega(2) \geq \omega(1) = \tilde{\omega}(1)$. Hence π is also an active space-time path for $\tilde{\omega}'$. Now distinguish two subcases:
(i(a)) If $(\omega(1), \omega(2)) \notin B$ then, by the definition of B (and noting that the time coordinates of a particle in $\mathcal{C}$ and a particle outside $\mathcal{C}$ differ at least $\delta_1 > \delta$) π is δ -stable.

(i(b)) If $(\omega(1), \omega(2)) \in G$, then (by definition) $\tilde{\omega}(2)(= \omega(2))$ has no $*$ ’s in $\mathcal{C}$; hence (see the note in (ia)) π is δ -stable.

(ii) If $(\omega(1), \omega(2)) \in B'$, then $\psi(\omega(1), \omega(2)) \in G$, so *each* particle in the configuration $\tilde{\omega}(2)$ represents an arrow. In particular $\tilde{\omega}(2)$ has all the particles, and their corresponding arrows, of π . Although the precise locations of these particles may have changed a bit, their relative order is the same, and is easy to see (see again the note in subcase (ia) and use that there are no $*$ particles in $\tilde{\omega}(2)$) that $\tilde{\omega}(2)$ has a δ -stable path within $\mathcal{C}$ from the the beginning of π to the end of π .

(iii) Finally, observe that $(\omega(1), \omega(2))$ can not be in G' , because of the men-

tioned space-time path π in $\tilde{\omega}(1)$ ($= \omega(1)$).

Concluding, the only way in which $\tilde{\omega}(2)$ has no δ -stable path from the the beginning of π to the end of π is when $|\mathcal{C}|$ is larger than $\beta' \log n$.

Using the above mentioned property of the single-cluster couplings (and noting that the condition, in Lemma 3.1, that $\eta_x^{(n)} = 1$ in the first copy, implies the existence of an active spacetime path to $(x, 0)$ in the first copy from some (y, t) satisfying $d(x, y) = \lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor$ or $t = -\sqrt{n}$), yields a similar property for the ‘overall’ coupling of $\mathcal{P}_q$ and $\mathcal{P}_{q'}$. This, together with the fact that, as we saw before (see (17)), the probability that there is a cluster $\mathcal{C}$ with $|\mathcal{C}| > \beta' \log n$ goes to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$, completes the proof of Lemma 3.1.

□

Fix a value $\hat{q}$ in the interval (q_1, q_2) , where $q_1 = 4\lambda_1/(4\lambda_1 + 1)$ as before (see (15)) and $q_2 = 4\lambda_2/(4\lambda_2 + 1)$.

Now we are ready to introduce 0 – 1 valued random variables to which we can apply the results in Section 2.2. Let the box B_n and the space-time region $ST(n)$ be as before (see the paragraph preceding Lemma 3.1). Now partition every time axis in intervals of length δ , with δ as defined a few lines before Lemma 3.1.

As before, we have on each time axis a Poisson point process with density 1, and each Poisson point is, independently of the others, of type $*$ with probability $1 - q$, and of each of the types $\rightarrow, \leftarrow, \uparrow, \downarrow$ with probability $q/4$. Let $v \in B_n$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq k \leq n/\delta$. By the k th interval of v (for the above mentioned partition) we will mean $\{v\} \times (-k\delta/4, (-k+1)\delta/4]$, and we define

$$X_*^{(v,k,\delta)} := I\{\exists \text{ a Poisson point of type } * \text{ in the } k\text{th interval of } v\}.$$

Similarly define

$$X_{\rightarrow}^{(v,k,\delta)} := I\{\exists \text{ a Poisson point of type } \rightarrow \text{ in the } k\text{th interval of } v\},$$

and, analogously, $X_{\leftarrow}^{(v,k,\delta)}$, $X_{\uparrow}^{(v,k,\delta)}$ and $X_{\downarrow}^{(v,k,\delta)}$. Note that this is a collection of independent 0 – 1 valued random variables.

Recall the definition of $\eta_v^{(n)}$ and $\bar{\nu}_{<q>}^{(n)}$ below equation (13). The X variables defined above, give only ‘crude’ information about the space-time diagram: they tell which of the types $*$, $\rightarrow$ etc. occur in each interval, but

they do not tell their precise locations inside the intervals. Nevertheless, this incomplete information is often enough to conclude that there is a certain space-time path. Let $\eta_v^{(n,\delta)}$ be the indicator of the event that the values of the $X^{(\cdot,\cdot,\delta)}$ variables imply that $\eta_v^{(n)} = 1$.

Remark: Note that if $\eta_v^{(n)} = 1$ then, after for some Poisson points with mark $*$ this mark is replaced by an arrow, still $\eta_v^{(n)} = 1$. The same remark holds for $\eta_v^{(n,\delta)}$ instead of $\eta_v^{(n)}$.

It is easy to see that

$$\eta_v^{(n)} \geq \eta_v^{(n,\delta)} \geq I\{\exists(w, t) \text{ with } d(v, w) = \lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor \text{ or } t = -\sqrt{n} \text{ s.t.} \quad (20) \\ \exists \delta\text{-stable space-time path from } (w, t) \text{ to } (v, 0)\}.$$

Hence, with the following notation (where R is a box)

$$H^{(n,\delta)}(R) := \{\exists \eta^{(n,\delta)}\text{-occupied horizontal crossing of } R\},$$

we get

$$\mathcal{P}_{\hat{q}}(H^{(n_i,\delta)}(L_{n_i})) \geq \mathcal{P}_{q_1}(\exists \eta^{(n_i)}\text{-occupied hor. crossing of } L_{n_i}) - o(n_i) \\ = \bar{\nu}_{< q_1}^{(n_i)}(H(L_{n_i}) - o(n_i),$$

where the inequality comes from the second inequality in (20) and Lemma 3.1, and the equality comes directly from the definitions.

By (15), and obvious monotonicity (see the Remark preceding (20)), this gives the following Lemma:

Lemma 3.2. *For each choice of α the following holds for all sufficiently large i :*

$$\mathcal{P}_q(H^{(n_i,\delta)}(L_{n_i})) > \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}}{2}, \quad q \geq \hat{q}. \quad (21)$$

Now we "wrap around the box B_{n_i} horizontally" (by identifying every vertex $(6n_i, y)$ on B_{n_i} with the vertex $(0, y)$), thus turning this box into a cylinder. Define $\eta_v^{(n_i,\delta,C)}$ as the natural analog, for the cylinder, of $\eta_v^{(n_i,\delta)}$.

Remark: By the truncation to distance $\sqrt{n}$ of these variables', and because the left and right side of L_{n_i} have distance larger than $\sqrt{n}$ to the boundary of B_{n_i} , the event that there is a $\eta^{(n_i,\delta,C)}$ -occupied horizontal crossing of L_{n_i}

and the event that there is a $\eta^{(n_i, \delta)}$ -occupied horizontal crossing of L_{n_i} are the same.

Let $A^{(n_i, \delta)}$ be the event that at least one of the $(6n_i - 1)$ horizontal translates of L_{n_i} on this cylinder has an $\eta^{(n_i, \delta, C)}$ -occupied horizontal crossing. Note that $A^{(n_i, \delta)}$ is still defined in terms of the random variables $X^{*, k, \delta}$ defined earlier. For each choice of α the following holds for all sufficiently large i :

$$\mathcal{P}_q(A^{(n_i, \delta)}) \geq \mathcal{P}_q(H^{(n_i, \delta)}(L_{n_i})) > \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}}{2}, \quad q \geq \hat{q}, \quad (22)$$

where the first inequality is (taking into account the above Remark) trivial and the last inequality is exactly Lemma 3.2.

As said before, the X variables are independent 0 – 1 valued random variables. Further, for each v and k , $X_*^{(v, k, \delta)}$ has probability $1 - \exp(-(1 - q)\delta)$ to be 1. If i is large enough (so that δ is small) this is larger than or equal to $(1 - q)\delta/2$. Each random variable $I_{\rightarrow}^{(v, k, \delta)}$ has probability $1 - \exp(-\delta q/4)$ to be 1, which is larger than $q\delta/8$ for i sufficiently large. The same holds for the other three arrow types.

Also note that the event $A^{(n_i, \delta)}$ is partially symmetric in the following sense: For fixed value k and fixed $0 \leq l \leq 3n$ all variables $X_{\rightarrow}^{v, k, \delta}$ with $v \in B_n$ with y -coordinate l , ‘play the same role’. In particular, each of them has the same probability to be pivotal for the event $A^{(n_i, \delta)}$. The same statement holds for each of the other three arrow types and for type $*$. Further note that for each k and l the number of such random variables $X_{\rightarrow}^{(v, k, \delta)}$ is of order n . (And, again, the same statement holds for each of the other types). By Corollary 2.8 (with m equal to our ‘current’ n) and a simple modification of Russo’s formula this yields

$$\frac{d}{dq} \mathcal{P}_q(A^{(n_i, \delta)}) \geq \frac{C_9 \mathcal{P}_q(A^{(n_i, \delta)}) (1 - \mathcal{P}_q(A^{(n_i, \delta)})) \log n}{\log(2/\delta)}, \quad q \in [\hat{q}, q_2], \quad (23)$$

where $C_9 > 0$ depends on $\hat{q}$ and q_2 only.

Let $\varepsilon^* > 0$. By (22), (23) and because $\mathcal{P}_q(A^{(n_i, \delta)})$ is clearly non-decreasing in q , it follows that, for every choice of α , the following holds for all sufficiently large i :

If $\mathcal{P}_{q_2}(A^{(n_i, \delta)}) < 1 - \varepsilon^*$, then, for all $q \in [\hat{q}, q_2]$,

$$\frac{d}{dq} \mathcal{P}_q(A^{(n_i, \delta)}) \geq C_9 \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}}{2} \varepsilon^* \frac{\log n}{\log(2/\delta)} \geq \frac{C_{10} \tilde{\varepsilon} \varepsilon^*}{\alpha},$$

(where the last inequality used that $\delta = n^{-\alpha}$), and hence

$$\mathcal{P}_{q_2}(A^{(n_i, \delta)}) \geq (q_2 - \hat{q})C_{10}\tilde{\varepsilon}\varepsilon^*/\alpha.$$

By choosing α sufficiently small this gives the following Lemma:

Lemma 3.3. *For every $\varepsilon^* > 0$ there is an $\alpha > 0$ such that for all sufficiently large i*

$$\mathcal{P}_{q_2}(A^{(n_i, \delta)}) > 1 - \varepsilon^*. \quad (24)$$

Now, if there is a horizontal crossing of one of the above mentioned translates of L_{n_i} , there must be a horizontal crossing in the ‘hard’ direction of at least one of the following (six) translates (on the cylinder) of the rectangle $[0, 3n_i] \times [n_i, 2n_i]$:

$$[jn_i, (j+3)n_i \pmod{6n_i}] \times [n_i, 2n_i], \quad 0 \leq j \leq 5.$$

Hence, by the usual ‘square root trick’,

$$\mathcal{P}_{q_2}(H^{(n_i, \delta)}([0, 3n_i] \times [n_i, 2n_i])) \geq 1 - (1 - \mathcal{P}_{q_2}(A^{(n_i, \delta)}))^{1/6},$$

which, combined with Lemma 3.3, immediately gives that for every $\varepsilon^* > 0$ there is an $\alpha > 0$ s.t. for all sufficiently large i

$$\mathcal{P}_{q_2}(H^{(n_i, \delta)}([0, 3n_i] \times [0, n_i])) > 1 - \varepsilon^*. \quad (25)$$

Finally, the following Proposition is obtained:

Proposition 3.4.

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\nu}_{\lambda_2}(H(3n_i, n_i)) = 1. \quad (26)$$

Proof. Let $\varepsilon^* > 0$ be given. By (12) (and the definition of q_2) $\bar{\nu}_{\lambda_2}(H(3n_i, n_i)) = \bar{\nu}_{<q_2>}(H(3n_i, n_i))$. Hence, by (16), $\liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\nu}_{\lambda_2}(H(3n_i, n_i))$ is equal to $\liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\nu}_{<q_2>}^{(n_i)}(H(3n_i, n_i))$ which, by the first inequality in (20), is larger than or equal to

$$\liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{P}_{q_2}(H^{(n_i, \delta)}([0, 3n_i] \times [0, n_i])).$$

This last expression is, by (the statement ending with) (25) and a suitable choice of α , larger than $1 - \varepsilon^*$. Summarizing, we have that for every $\varepsilon^* > 0$, $\liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\nu}_{\lambda_2}(H(3n_i, n_i))$ is larger than $1 - \varepsilon^*$. $\square$

Proposition 3.4, together with the finite-size criterion Lemma 2.3, immediately yields $\bar{\nu}_{\lambda_2}(|\mathcal{C}_O| = \infty) > 0$, which, as observed in the beginning of this Section, completes the proof of Theorem 1.1. □

Acknowledgments I thank Oliver Riordan for a very useful discussion concerning influence and sharp-threshold results, and in particular for pointing out Corollary 2.6 for general m . The work in this paper was partly done during (or significantly influenced by) visits to the Isaac Newton Institute in June 2008, the Institut Henri Poincaré in October 2008 and the Institut Mittag-Leffler in April and June 2009. I thank these institutes for their support and hospitality. Finally, I thank Jeff Steif and Geoffrey Grimmett for several useful discussions.

References

- [1] M. Aizenman and D. Barsky, Sharpness of the phase transition in percolation models, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **108**, 489–526 (1987).
- [2] A. Balint, F. Camia and R. Meester, Sharp phase transition and critical behaviour in 2D divide and colour models, *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* **119**, 937–965 (2009).
- [3] J. van den Berg, Approximate zero-one laws and sharpness of the percolation transition in a class of models including two-dimensional Ising percolation, *Ann. Probab.* **36**, 1880–1903 (2008).
- [4] J. van den Berg, R. Brouwer and B. Vágvölgyi, Box-crossings and continuity results for self-destructive percolation in the plane. In: In and Out of Equilibrium 2 (eds. V. Sidoravicius and M.-E. Vares), series *Progress in Probability* (volume 60), 117–135, Birkhäuser (2008).
- [5] J. van den Berg and J.E. Steif, On the existence and non-existence of finitary codings for a class of random fields, *Ann. Probab.* **27**, 1501–1522 (1999).
- [6] C. Bezuidenhout and G. Grimmett, The critical contact process dies out, *Ann. Probab.* **18**, 1462–1482 (1990).

- [7] C. Bezuidenhout and G. Grimmett, Exponential decay for subcritical contact and percolation processes, *Ann. Probab.* **19**, 984–1009 (1991).
- [8] B. Bollobás and O. Riordan, The critical probability for random Voronoi percolation in the plane is $1/2$, *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* **136**, 417–468 (2006).
- [9] B. Bollobás and O. Riordan, Sharp thresholds and percolation in the plane, *Random Struct. Alg.* **29**, 524–548 (2006).
- [10] B. Bollobás and O. Riordan, *Percolation*, Cambridge University Press (2006).
- [11] B. Bollobás and O. Riordan, Percolation on random Johnson-Mehl tessellations and related models, *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* **140**, 319–343 (2008).
- [12] B. Bollobás and O. Riordan, Erratum: Percolation on random Johnson-Mehl tessellations and related models, arXiv:0905.1275v1 (2009).
- [13] Chayes, J.T. and Chayes, L. Percolation and random media, *Critical Phenomena, Random Systems and Gauge Theories* (K. Oswalder and R. Stora, eds.), Les Houches, Session XLIII, 1984, Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp. 1001–1142.
- [14] E. Friedgut and G. Kalai, Every monotone graph property has a sharp threshold. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **124**, 2993–3002 (1996).
- [15] B.T. Graham and G.R. Grimmett, Influence and sharp-threshold theorems for monotonic measures, *Ann. Probab.* **34**, 1726–1745 (2006).
- [16] G.R. Grimmett. *Percolation*, second edition, Springer (1999).
- [17] Y. Higuchi, A sharp transition for the two-dimensional Ising percolation, *PTRF* **97**, 489–514 (1993).
- [18] J. Kahn, G. Kalai and N. Linial, The influence of variables on Boolean functions, *Proc. 29-th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, 68–80, Computer Society Press (1988).
- [19] S. Kéfi et al. Spatial vegetation patterns and imminent desertification in Mediterranean arid ecosystems, *Nature* **449**, 213–217 (2007).

- [20] H. Kesten, The critical probability of bond percolation on the square lattice equals $\frac{1}{2}$, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **74**, 41–59 (1980).
- [21] H. Kesten, Analyticity properties and power law estimates of functions in percolation theory, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **25**, 717–756 (1981).
- [22] H. Kesten, Scaling relations for 2D percolation, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **109**, 109–156 (1987).
- [23] T.M. Liggett, *Interacting Particle Systems*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, Vol. 276, Springer (1985).
- [24] T.M. Liggett, *Stochastic Interacting Systems: Contact, Voter and Exclusion Processes*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften (Volume 324), Springer (1999).
- [25] T.M. Liggett and J. Steif, Stochastic Domination: The Contact Process, Ising Models and FKG Measures, *Annales Inst. H. Poincaré, Probab. et Stat.* **42**, 223–243 (2006).
- [26] M.V. Menshikov, Coincidence of critical points in percolation problems, *Soviet Math. Dokl.* **33**, 856–859 (1986).
- [27] R. Rossignol, Threshold phenomena on product spaces: BKKKL revisited (once more), *Electr. Comm. Probab.* **13**, 35–44 (2008).
- [28] L. Russo, An approximate zero-one law, *ZfW* **61**, 129–139 (1982).
- [29] M. Talagrand, On Russo’s approximate zero-one law, *Ann. Probab.* **22**, 1576–1587 (1994).